

Remarks

The Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Examiner's Office Action dated April 4, 2005. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the comments set forth below.

By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 4, and 6 are amended. These amendments are intended to clarify the claimed invention and, as such, do not change the scope of the claims. Accordingly, claims 1-8 are pending in the present application.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over "Procedures for Real Time Group 3 Facsimile Communication Over IP Networks" article in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,765,931 to Rabenko et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Rabenko") for the reasons set forth from in paragraph 2 spanning pages 2-8 of the Action. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As explained in paragraph [0008] of the originally-filed specification, the conventional transmission scheme taught by the "Procedures ..." article requires every facsimile User Datagram Protocol Transport Layer (UDPTL) packet to have a primary field and a secondary field without exception. Applicants' recognition that not all UDPTL packets need a secondary field in consideration of the G3 facsimile transmission takes into account their recognition that the unnecessary secondary fields wastefully increase a load on the IP network, as well as burdening the transmitter buffer of the Internet facsimile transmitter to prevent efficient transmission. Thus, the Applicants' invention aims at providing a communication connecting device and a data output control method capable of reducing a load on a data transmitter terminal unit and an IP network, as described in paragraph [0009] of the originally-filed specification.

In order to achieve the communication connecting device according to the invention, the device includes a terminal unit control circuit for storing data received from a first terminal unit or second terminal unit, and controlling the first terminal unit in accordance with a first communication standard; a first storage storing size information representative of a size of data to be coded; a coding/decoding circuit for collectively coding the data in accordance with the size information read out of the first storage and the first communication standard or decoding coded data received from the second terminal unit in accordance with the first communication standard and determining whether the coded data decoded is a response to data sent from the first terminal unit or retransmitted data; a second storage for storing the coded data against a loss of the coded data output from said coding/decoding circuit; **an information adding/separating circuit for filtering, when adding a header and data for making up for the loss of the coded data to the coded data in accordance with a second communication standard that relates to the IP network, the data in response to a response detection signal output from the coding/decoding circuit and representative of the response or separating coded data from data received from the second terminal unit and feeding the coded data separated to the coding/decoding circuit;** and an interfacing circuit for converting the coded data input **via the information adding/separating circuit** to a signal based on a command or converting a signal received from the second terminal unit to the coded data (Claim 1, emphasis added).

As shown in the illustrative embodiment, this is accomplished with a data deletion control circuit 180b that is adapted to supply the buffer 20 with signals 42. The signals

include a deletion enable signal for deleting previous IFP (Internet Facsimile Protocol) packet data stored in the buffer 20 and deletion start address data indicative of a start or top address from which the data to delete are stored. The buffer 20 is adapted to be responsive thereto to delete the stored IFP packet data meant for the secondary field. The data deletion control circuit 180b is further adapted to feed, upon deletion of the IFP packet, the address control circuit for secondary field 180a with an address reset signal 182 to cause it to reset its address value under management to a predetermined value. This is described in paragraph [0024] of the originally-filed specification.

The Action acknowledges that the “Procedure ...” article does not disclose the recited **information adding/separating circuit for filtering, when adding a header and data for making up for the loss of the coded data to the coded data in accordance with a second communication standard that relates to the IP network, the data in response to a response detection signal output from the coding/decoding circuit and representative of the response or separating coded data from data received from the second terminal unit and feeding the coded data separated to the coding/decoding circuit**. However, it is the Action’s position that Rabenko discloses the recited information adding/separating circuit and the sixth step of method claim 6. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Column 9, lines 51-59 of Rabenko generally states that “DOCSIS MAC 112 extracts DOCSIS MAC frames from MPEG-2 frames, processes MAC headers, and filters and processes messages and data”. Similarly, column 17, lines 30-48 of Rabenko simply disclose that downstream functions of the DOCSIS MAC may include “processing the MAC header, filtering messages and data, processing ... messages,

decrypting data packets if necessary and providing cyclic redundancy checks (CRCs) on the MAC payloads.” The last section of Rabenko cited, column 18, lines 45-61, provides a general teaching of “what type of filtering should be applied to the packet based on information contained in the MAC header”. No where does any of these passages disclose, teach or suggest an information adding/separating circuit as “filtering when adding a header and data for making up for the loss of the coded data to the coded data in accordance with a second communication standard that relates to the IP network” as recited in independent claim 1. The Action does not provide cites to any passage in Rabenko that supports its position that the claim language reprinted on lines 1-6 of page 4 of the Action is taught or even suggested by Rabenko. Thus, the Action fails to provide a prima facie case of obviousness.

With respect to independent claim 6, the sixth step “selectively [executes], in accordance with the response detection signal, [1)] first filtering that reads out in accordance with a second communication standard relating to the IP network, a header for the coded data and the coded data stored against the loss of the code data and adds the header and the coded data to newly input coded data, or [2)] a second filtering that deletes the coded data currently stored”. It is the Action’s position that the passages referred to above and column 17, lines 62-67 discloses the above sixth step. Applicants disagree.

Contrary to the claimed invention, Rabenko fails to disclose a second filtering that deletes coded data currently stored. Column 17, lines 59-67 of Rabenko states that:

The MAC header processing blocks ... examine the MAC header for type, wherein the MAC header processor in the message processor 282 processes only MAC messages while the MAC header in the downstream DES 284 processes packets that are not MAC messages.

The incoming MAC header is parsed for the presence of an extended header field. If the extended header field is present, the MAC header processor block parses the ...

Thus, column 17, lines 59-67 of Rabenko do not support the Action's position that Rabenko discloses selectively executing 1) or 2) as recited in independent claim 6. Thus Rabenko cannot render obvious the claimed invention. It is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have modified the "Procedure..." article to obtain the specific recited circuit and selective executing of claims 1 and 6, respectively in view of the general passages cited in Rabenko.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 6 and their dependent claims 2-5 and 7-8, respectively are allowable over the prior art of record. Reconsideration of the application and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner is of the opinion that the prosecution of the application would be advanced by a personal interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone undersigned counsel to arrange for such an interview.

Respectfully submitted,

July 5, 2005



Catherine M. Voorhees
Registration No. 33,074
VENABLE LLP
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, D.C. 20043-9998
Telephone: (202) 344-4000
Telefax : (202) 344-8300

CMV
DC2/661868